

**STAFF USE ONLY**

PROJECT NUMBER: 97-178

CASES: TR 52419

OTP, CP, ZC



**\*\*\*\*\* INITIAL STUDY \*\*\*\*\***

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES  
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: March 14, 2003 Staff Member: Hsiao-ching Chen

Thomas Guide: 588 ABCD-1, 557 J-7, 558 ABCD-7 USGS Quad: Calabasas, Thousand Oaks

Location: Southwesterly and southeasterly of Kanan and Cornell Roads, Agoura Hills

Description of Project: The project is a request for a tract map, oak tree permit, zone change (from CPD to RPD), and Conditional Use Permit (for development within SEA, density variation, and grading) to allow the development of 81 single family residences on three existing parcels. Project will also include off-site improvements associated with the subdivision including grading to create sufficient line-of-sight. The development area will be approximately 54 out of 320 acres.

Gross Area: 320 acres

Environmental Setting: Project site is located in the central Santa Monica Mountains in an unincorporated Los Angeles County adjacent to and south of the City of Agoura Hills. Kanan and Cornell Roads run generally north/south through the center of the project site and divide the property into 3 parcels. Site is approximately 1/4 mile south of Ventura Freeway. The site is currently vacant and undeveloped and occupies mountainous terrain and alluvial floodplain on the east and west sides of Medea Creek. The eastern portion of the site is located within the Las Virgenes SEA (No. 6), which is described as supporting grassland, coastal sage scrub, chaparral, and coast live oak woodland. Archaeological sites have been reported on the property as well.

Zoning: RPD-1-27.5, CPD

General Plan: Non-urban (148 AC), Significant Ecological Area(172.3 AC)

Community/Area Wide Plan: Mountain Lands 5, Rural Residential (Santa Monica Mtns North Area Plan)

**Major projects in area:**

Project Number

Description & Status

98-187/TR52805

5 SF on 107.8 AC (pending)

98-019/ PM 25062

4 SF lots on 40 AC (pending)

CUP 01-066

soild fill project (pending)

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

**REVIEWING AGENCIES**

Responsible Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Regional Water Quality Control Board
- ☒ Los Angeles Region
- ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☒ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☒ Caltrans

Trustee Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ State Fish and Game
- ☒ State Parks
- ☒ US Fish and Wildlife Service
- ☐ \_\_\_\_\_

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☒ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☒ DOC Mines and Geology
- ☒ Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.
- ☒ City of Agoura Hills
- ☒ Las Virgenes Municipal WD
- ☒ Las Virgenes Unified SD
- ☒ City of Calabasas
- ☒ AQMD
- ☒ City of Malibu
- ☐ \_\_\_\_\_

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☒ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ DPW: Watershed Mgt., Program Development, Traffic & Lighting, Drainage & Grading, Geo & Materials Eng., Transportation Planning
- ☒ Fire Department
- ☒ Parks & Recreation
- ☒ Sanitation Districts
- ☒ Sheriff
- ☒ Library

## IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX			ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Pg		Less than Significant Impact/No Impact		
						Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation	
						Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg				Potential Concern	
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Grading, liquefection	
	2. Flood	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	100 year flood area	
	3. Fire	7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Fire Zone 4	
	4. Noise	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise from construction and operation	
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hillside development	
	2. Air Quality	10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Construction	
	3. Biota	11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lyon's pentachaeta, dudleya, oak trees	
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Known sites on property	
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Kanan Road is scenic	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Exceed CMP threshold	
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Concern of the public)	
	3. Education	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	All schools are currently operating over capacity	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(Concern of the public)	
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	(General concern of water in the area)	
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	3. Land Use	23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zone change, SEA compatibility	
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Demand for park and recreation increases	
	Mandatory Findings	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

### DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS) \*

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

- Development Policy Map Designation: Non-urban hillsides, other non-urban & agricultural, SEA
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
- ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☒ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: 5/14/03

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

\*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

## Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

- ☐ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

- ☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

- ☒ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT\*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

- ☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Hsiao-ching Chen

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: Daryl Koutnik

Date: 15 MAY 2003

- ☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.
- ☐ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filing fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

\*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

## HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- |    | Yes                                 | No                                  | Maybe                    |   |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?<br><br><u>Earthquake-induced landslides (Per Seismic Hazards Map -Calabasas Quad)</u>   |
| b. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? <u>Earthquake-induced landslides (Per Seismic Hazards Map -Calabasas Quad); Geotechnical Feasibility Study dated 11/26/97 by Pacific Soils Engineering, Inc. indicates that no significant landslides were mapped on the site but the other study done previously suggested possible on or new site landslides.</u> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? <u>relatively stable (per Geotechnical Feasibility Study dated 11/26/97 by Pacific Soils Engineering, Inc.)</u>   |
| d. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? <u>Liquefaction area exists within the property; groundwater encountered in northwestern portion of the property (per Geotechnical Feasibility Study dated 11/26/97 by Pacific Soils Engineering, Inc.)</u>   |
| e. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?<br><br><u>Project is residential and site contain seismic hazards</u>  |
| f. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%? <u>Grading plan shows 563,000 c.y. of grading and additional grading of approximately 131,500 c.y. will be necessary to creat sufficient line of sight off-site. Grading will be balanced on site.</u>   |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? _____   |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____  |

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

☒ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size      ☐ Project Design      ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

To be discussed in the DEIR.

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☒ Potentially significant      ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation      ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## HAZARDS - 2. Flood

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?  
Medea Creek crosses the central portion of the property between Kanan and Cornell Rds.
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? Within 100 year flood area and flood prone area
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off? Total debris potential from the slopes of Ladyface Mountain that could be carried easterly through the project site is approximately 6,100 cubic yards (per project's Hydrology Study).  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?  
Storm drain prepared for subdivision.
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? \_\_\_\_\_

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)  
☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

### ☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ Lot Size ☒ To be discussed in the DEIR

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

- ☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

### HAZARDS - 3. Fire

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?  
Fire Zone 4 (per LA Co General Plan Safety Element Plate 7)
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? Project is proposing 81 units
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? \_\_\_\_\_
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

#### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8

☒ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

To be discussed in the DEIR

#### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## HAZARDS - 4. Noise

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?  
Site is approximately 1/4 mile south of Ventura Freeway.
- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?  
Project is residential and adjacent to existing residential uses
- c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?  
Site is currently undeveloped
- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?  
Construction activities
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size

☐ Project Design

☐ Compatible Use

To be discussed in the DEIR

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?  
Greater Medea Creek watershed
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ ☐ ☐ If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?  
N/A
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?  
Construction adjacent to stream
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?  
Urban runoff
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Industrial Waste Permit ☐ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5
- ☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- ☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

- ☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?  
Project is proposing 81 residential units
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?  
Threshold for single family residential development is 166 units.
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?  
Project grading and construction
- e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  
SCQMD is non-attainment area.
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g. ☐ ☐ ☒ Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- h. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors: \_\_\_\_\_

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design

☒ Air Quality Report

To be discussed in the DEIR

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

### RESOURCES - 3. Biota

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?  
SEA No. 6 - Las Virgenes
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?  
64 out of 320 acres of the site will be within the development area.
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?  
Medea Creek
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?  
Coastal sage scrub, coast live oak woodland, willow riparian forest
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?  
Oak trees, willows
- f. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?  
Lyon's petacheta, Dudleya, red-legged frog
- g. ☒ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?  
Wildlife corridor

#### ☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Oak Tree Permit ☒ SEATAC Review

To be discussed in the DEIR

#### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?  
Oak trees, drainage course, undeveloped land
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?  
Nine prehistoric archaeological sites and one isolate located within the project area
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? Site contains known archaeological sites and the proposed development may impact those sites.
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size      ☐ Project Design      ☒ Phase I Archaeology Report

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological**, **historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☒ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- |    | Yes                      | No                                  | Maybe                    |  |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?<br><br>_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?<br><br>_____   |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?<br><br>_____  |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____<br><br>_____  |

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size                      ☐ Project Design

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?  
Kanan Road is a scenic highway
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?  
Zuma Ridge trail
- c. ☒ ☐ ☐ Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? Site is currently undeveloped and at the base of Ladyface Mountain.
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?  
Site is adjacent to residential uses.
- e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?  
Future street lighting in the project area
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): \_\_\_\_\_

### ☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size      ☐ Project Design      ☒ Visual Report      ☐ Compatible Use

See DEIR.

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☒ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?  
81 units are proposed and U.S. 101 to the north is highly congested.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?  
Existing LOS on Kanan and Cornell Roads are Level A
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?  
Cul-de-sac street exceeding 1000 feet in length
- e. ☒ ☐ ☐ Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### ☒ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design    ☒ Traffic Report    ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

See DEIR.

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

☒ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?  
Tapia Water Reclamation Facility of Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?  
Sewer line capacity is adequate.
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- ☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130
- ☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The subject is to be included in the EIR in response to public concern

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

- ☐ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than significant/No impact

### SERVICES - 3. Education

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create student transportation problems?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

#### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Site Dedication      ☒ Government Code Section 65995      ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

\_\_\_\_\_

#### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☒ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site? LA Co Fire Station No. 65 is located on 4206 N. Cornell Rd and is adjacent to the site. Malibu/Lost Hills Sheriff Station is located at 27050 Agoura Road which is 3 miles from the project site.
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
- c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

#### ☐ Fire Mitigation Fees

The subject is to be included in the EIR in response to public concern.

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

- ☐ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?  
Las Virgenes Water District
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d. ☐ ☐ ☒ Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? Soild waste generated from site will be transferred to Calabasas and Sunshine Canyon Landfills
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

Water issues to be analyzed due to general concern on water in the area.

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- |    | Yes                      | No                                  | Maybe                    |   |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?<br>_____   |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?<br>_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?<br>_____                           |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____<br>_____   |

### STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot size      ☐ Project Design      ☐ Compatible Use

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

☐ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- h. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- i. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- j. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean up Plan

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant    ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation    ☒ Less than significant/No impact

### OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

#### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?  
*Project includes a Zone Change request* \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
- ☐ ☒ ☐ Hillside Management Criteria?
- ☒ ☐ ☐ SEA Conformance Criteria?  
*Project includes a SEA CUP request and project's compatibility with SEA needs to be discussed.*
- ☐ ☐ ☐ Other? \_\_\_\_\_
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project physically divide an established community?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

#### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

### SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- d. ☐ ☒ ☐ Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?  
*Project will increase demand for park and recreation services*  
\_\_\_\_\_
- f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  
\_\_\_\_\_
- g. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### ☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

*Demand for park and recreation services will be discussed in the DEIR.*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

### CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

☒ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☐ Less than significant/No impact

## MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

- Yes   No   Maybe
- a. ☒   ☐   ☐ Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Biota

- b. ☐   ☒   ☐ Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

- c. ☐   ☐   ☒ Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Water quality, air quality

## CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☒ Potentially significant   ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation   ☐ Less than significant/No impact